

III. REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 6 and 8 have been amended and claims 3-5 and 13-26 have been canceled. As a result, claims 1, 2 and 6-12 remain pending in this application. Applicant is not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the subject matter. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant has canceled claims 13-19. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant have amended claim 7 to depend from claim 6. Claims 1-2, 4, 5, 7, 13-14, 16, 20-21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burger *et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0220876), hereafter “Burger,” in view of Le (U.S. Patent Pub. 2005/0037647 A1), hereafter “Le.” Claims 3, 8-9, 15 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burger in view of Le and further in view of Silberschatz (“Operating System Concepts: Fifth Edition,” 1999), hereafter “Silberschatz.” Claims 6, 18,19 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burger in view of Le and further in view of McGuffin (U.S. Patent No. 7,010,671 B2), hereafter “McGuffin.” Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burger in view of Le and Silberschatz and further in view of Ichikawa

(U.S. Patent No. 5,617,560), hereafter “Ichikawa.” Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burger in view of Le, Silberschatz and McGuffin. Claims 17 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burger in view of Le and Ichikawa.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejections over Burger and Le, Applicant asserts that the references cited by the Office do not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention as amended. For example, with respect to independent claims 1 and 8, Applicant submits that the cited references fail the claimed invention as currently claimed. Applicant has amended these claims to consolidate features from several of the previously dependent claims. In addition, Applicant has added features not included in the cited references, including a limitation that the removable storage medium is accessible to only one of the operating systems at any one time and another limitation that the first set of program code and the second set of program code provide the operating systems functionality to perform common operations on the common datastore. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not teach or suggest these limitations and/or the totality of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With respect to dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicant submits that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features.

Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 18, 2008

/Hunter E. Webb/

Hunter E. Webb

Reg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

RAD/hew